

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently active.

The application is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent No. 6,239,830, filed May 17, 1999; which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,084, filed on January 21, 1998. As originally filed, this is stated on page 26, line 25, and these patents are incorporated by reference. Antecedent support for Claims 12-19 is found in column 4, lines 15 and 16; column 5, lines 29-31 and column 6, lines 24 and 25; column 8, lines 51-56 and column 9, line 3 through column 10, line 30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,239,830. Claim 20 is found on column 4, line 63 to column 5, line 7. Claim 21 is found on column 4, lines 15 and 16 and Claim 1 of the '830 patent.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 7 as being patentable over Hamagishi in view of Wiseman. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Referring to Hamagishi, there is disclosed a 3-D display device, a shading barrier 10 which is constituted by vertical stripe-shaped slits 11 and barriers 12 arranged between an LCD panel 20 and a light source 30 emitting light in a plane shape. The light emitted from the light source passes through the slit 11 of the shading barrier 10 and is

incident on the right eye and the left eye of a viewer upon passing through pixel apertures of the LCD panel. A black matrix portion 22 is provided between the pixel apertures 21 of the LCD panel 20. See column 7, lines 40-50. Hamagishi teaches a multiplexer 109 which switches the first and second selected states of each of the switches are switched in accordance with the first switching timing. That is, in a first data output. In a horizontal scanning period on the display screen, pixels caused by primary color data selected in the first selected state are displayed period and a second data output of that period, pixels caused by primary color data selected in the second selected state are displayed. Each of the first and second data output periods are composed of three red, green and blue columns of pixels. See column 12, lines 31-42.

Referring to Wiseman, there is taught a three-dimensional display. Pictures of an object are formed by cameras ranged around the object 2 and pointing at it from different directions. One picture at a time is reproduced on the display. The display can find a direction from which the picture is visible. It does this so that the direction of visibility matches the direction of the camera from which the picture is received. Other pictures are shown from other cameras in a similar manner. Once the picture from each of the cameras has been shown, the sequence is repeated. The rate of repetition is such that the display of each picture to each direction will appear continuous to an observer inspecting the display from different angles. See column 4, lines 5-25.

Wiseman teaches a color filter comprising a plurality of individually switchable regions 13. Each of these regions can be switched between one of a number of colors, red, green and blue. In operation, each of the regions of the filter is activated to change color immediately after its corresponding light source has been deactivated, so that the time period in which each region must change is the next required color is maximized. This enables the employment of a filter with a reduced switching speed for each of its regions.

It is respectfully submitted these references have nothing to do with each other and the teachings cannot be combined. As described above, Hamagishi does not teach the use of multiple cameras, for each camera to form its own image to be shown at predetermined times to a viewer, but instead teaches to use two different selected states to be displayed at various times to a viewer. The state have nothing to do with separate cameras. Furthermore, Wiseman teaches to use a color filter to create the red, green and blue. Hamagishi has nothing at all to do and does not teach the need for a color filter. It is black letter law that there must be some teaching or suggestion in the references themselves to combine teachings the Examiner is relying upon, and here, there is none.

It is respectfully submitted the Examiner is using hindsight to arrive at applicants' claimed invention. The Examiner is using applicants' limitations of the claims as a

roadmap to find the different limitations in the different references, and having found them concluding that applicants' claimed invention is arrived at. This is not patent law.

Furthermore, the teachings of the different references cannot be taken out of context in which they are found. The context of Hamagishi has to do with a single image that is displayed to a viewer in two different predetermined states. The context of Hamagishi is a totally different architecture requiring a plurality of cameras which form images, which are sequentially provided to a viewer through a color filter. One has nothing to do with the other. There is no teaching or suggestion for Hamagishi to be modified to somehow or other accommodate the architecture required by Wiseman to accomplish the result that Wiseman attains, and there is no teaching or suggestion in Wiseman to be modified to somehow or other accommodate the two predetermined states for a single viewer without the need of a plurality of cameras or a color filter to attain the result that Hamagishi desires. Accordingly, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest Claims 1 and 7 of applicants' claimed invention.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-5, 8 and 9 as being unpatentable over Hamagishi in view of Wiseman and Sullivan. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The Examiner cites Sullivan solely for the teaching of a display screen, a computer includes a field programmable gate array to perform encoding into three bit maps, and a ferroelectric liquid crystal. Sullivan does not add anything to the teachings of Hamagishi and Wiseman in

regard to the limitation of "a light blocking shutter disposed in front of the display screen forming a stripe pattern which lets through only 1/3 of each stripe of the image on the display screen during each of the at least three distinct phases. Accordingly, Claims 2-5, 8 and 9 are patentable over the applied art of record.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 6, 10 and 11 as being unpatentable over Hamagishi in view of Wiseman in view of Sullivan in view of Johnson. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The sole reason the Examiner cites Johnson is for the teaching of the shutter comprising a pi-cell. Johnson does not add anything to the teachings of Hamagishi and Wiseman in regard to the limitation of "a light blocking shutter disposed in front of the display screen forming a stripe pattern which lets through only 1/3 of each stripe of the image on the display screen during each of the at least three distinct phases. Accordingly, Claims 6, 10 and 11 are patentable over the applied art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections and objections to this application be reconsidered and withdrawn, and Claims 1-11, now in this application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

KENNETH PERLIN, ET AL.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the U.S. Postal
Service as first class mail in an envelope
addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-
1450 on 4/17/06

Ansel M. Schwartz
Ansel M. Schwartz
Registration No. 30,587

By Ansel M. Schwartz

Ansel M. Schwartz, Esquire
Reg. No. 30,587
One Sterling Plaza
201 N. Craig Street
Suite 304
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 621-9222

Attorney for Applicants